

18th CONGRESS, }  
1st Session.

[ 19 ]

# MEMORIAL

OF THE

*Members of the House of Representatives and Farmers*

OF

PENNSYLVANIA,

PRAYING

**A Modification of the Tariff.**

---

JANUARY 5, 1824.

Referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

---

WASHINGTON:

PRINTED BY GALES & SEATON.

1824.

MEMORANDUM

MEMORANDUM FOR THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

PENNSYLVANIA

A Resolution of the Senate

RECEIVED JAN 2 1874

For the purpose of the Senate

RECEIVED

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

1874

## MEMORIAL.

*To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled,*

The Memorial of the subscribers, Members of the House of Representatives, and Farmers, of the State of Pennsylvania,

RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:

That your memorialists, wholly cultivators of the soil, and no otherwise concerned in manufactures than in their own families, are firmly persuaded that the solid interests of the nation require, that an efficient protection be afforded to the manufacturing portion of our fellow-citizens, who, with few exceptions, have been greatly depressed ever since the return of peace.

The depression of manufactures has had the effect to injure agriculture, in a two-fold point of view:

1st, From the close of the late war, it has driven thousands of manufacturers and artisans, natives as well as emigrants, to agriculture: thus depriving the farmers of a considerable portion of the domestic market for the necessaries of life, which those classes afford; and, moreover, converting customers into rivals, by the surplus produce, beyond their own consumption, created by those persons thus deprived of employment at their usual occupations, and compelled to resort, for support, to the cultivation of the soil; thereby perniciously increasing that glut in foreign markets, to which may be fairly traced nearly the whole of the complicated distresses experienced by the farming interest, in the middle states, in past years, particularly in 1820 and 1821.

2dly, The want of sufficient protection of manufactures greatly impairs the market for raw materials, hemp, flax, iron, hides, skins, &c. for which, at present, the demand is languid, and, in many cases, the price hardly adequate to the remuneration of the producer.

The idea which, in common with the majority of our agricultural brethren, we long entertained, of the advantages resulting from purchasing goods abroad, because they can be had cheaper than at home, has been proved, by experience, to be ruinously fallacious. The saving, supposing a saving really to be made, of a few dollars, in the expense of clothing and other manufactured articles, is but a poor compensation for the great diminution of the domestic market for raw materials, and for the loss of a quarter, or half a dollar, in the price of a bushel of wheat, and in that proportion, in other agricultural productions; which diminution and loss are necessary results of that policy, which

so essentially and inevitably impairs the domestic market for those productions. But experience, which is an incomparably safer guide than theory, abundantly proves, that even the poor saving, which has been so speciously held out, to induce the agriculturists to oppose any further protection of manufactures, has no existence. Of this position, the event of the high duties imposed on coarse cotton goods, removes all possibility of doubt: as the American markets have been steadily supplied, for years, with those articles, very far superior to the imported, and at a much lower rate than we formerly had to pay for the worthless foreign article, for which they are a substitute. It, therefore, clearly appears, that high duties, in this instance, so far from proving injurious to the agricultural interest, have conferred on it a solid and substantial benefit: thus proving the utter fallacy of dogmas, hitherto received by the mass of our citizens with the most implicit confidence. And there is every reason to believe, that the same results would follow the adoption of a similar course of proceeding in the case of woollen, iron, and other manufactures. If it were necessary to adduce foreign facts and experience, to prove this effect of domestic competition, both would be amply found in the case of Great Britain, which excludes, by duties nearly tantamount to prohibitions, almost all foreign manufactures, and is yet enabled to undersell, in manufactured goods, in their own markets, those nations which do not protect the industry of their people by adequate duties.

Whatever plausible arguments might be found for the refusal to afford adequate protection to manufactures, during the wars of the French Revolution, when we had abundant markets for all our agricultural productions, are totally inapplicable to our present situation, in consequence of the exclusion of our bread stuffs from nearly all the ports in Europe, unless when the failure of crops produces a danger of famine. Thus, those nations, from which we receive such immense amounts of manufactured articles, refuse to receive the chief, indeed almost the only important productions, with which nature enables the inhabitants of the middle states to pay for them. We might, therefore, as we have done in the case of our tonnage, without impropriety, reciprocate prohibition by prohibition. But this is not called for. Such an increase of duty as would prevent our manufacturers from being overwhelmed in our own markets by their foreign rivals, would be sufficient for the purpose.

The pernicious effect of the above exclusion is palpable, from the reduction in the amount and value of the flour exported from the United States lately, as follows:

	Quantity.	Amount.
	Barrels.	Dollars.
Average of 1811, 12, 13 -	1,383,149	13,980,000
1816, 17, 18 -	1,121,982	12,346,764
1821, 22, 23 -	879,743	4,819,506

Thus, it incontestably appears, that the fortunes and prosperity of those of your fellow citizens engaged in the first and most important of all human pursuits, the raising of grain, and other necessities of life, are held by the precarious tenure of the seasons in Europe. If they are adverse, farming may be prosperous in the United States; but, if otherwise, our hopes of a fair remuneration for our labors are blighted and withered. This servile dependance on the state of the European markets is, we respectfully submit, unworthy of an enlightened age, and an independent nation, blest with such transcendent advantages as Heaven has lavished on the United States. Such a state of things is destructive of the vital interests of above two-fifths of the white population of the Union, depending chiefly on farming; and, on every principle of justice, calls loudly on the national representatives for a prompt and decisive remedy.

The protection of that important portion of industry employed in manufactures, at all times a sound and necessary policy, and supported by the opinions of the wisest statesmen, and the example of the most prosperous nations, has become, at present, an imperious duty, the foreign demand for our staples having, as above stated, considerably decreased—the quantity about one-third, and the amount nearly two-thirds, since 1811, notwithstanding the increase of our population in the intervening period. Whereas, our demands for manufactured goods must increase with our increasing population. We, in consequence, buy more from, than we sell to, foreign nations; and this, with nations, is as unerringly the road to ruin, as it is with respect to individuals.

Were there any doubt on the important subject thus respectfully presented to your view, it would be removed by a comparison of any two tracts of our country, in one of which manufactures are carried on extensively, and in the other, agricultural pursuits chiefly, or wholly, particularly when remote from the advantages of sea-port towns, as is the case with one-half of our territories. In the one, agriculture and horticulture, certain of steady and increasing markets, are carried on with life and spirit—lands are rising in price—every thing flourishes—and, what is of incalculable importance to the farmers, their females and children find valuable employment in and from the factories, for fragments of time which would otherwise be wholly lost. Habits of industry are thus acquired and rewarded, and public and private prosperity promoted. Whereas, in parts of the country destitute of manufacturing establishments, circulation is either arrested, or moves with a sluggish pace—money is rare, and difficult to be procured; there are no markets for horticultural articles; lands are of little comparative value; in a word, every thing languishes. To exemplify this position, and to place it beyond the power of contradiction, it is sufficient to refer to the neighborhood of Providence and Wilmington, on the one hand; and numerous districts in the interior of Pennsylvania, and in the fertile districts of Kentucky and Tennessee, on the other. The difference of soil, and some other natural advantages, is greatly in favor of the latter. But the



contrast in prosperity is immensely in favor of the former; and the inference, in support of the system we advocate, irresistible.

We, therefore, respectfully request you will adopt such a modification of the existing tariff, as may afford complete protection to the manufactures of our common country.

*Jonathan Roberts,  
J. Knight,  
James Keys,  
Jos. Ritner,  
Samuel Black,  
Lemuel Sheator,  
James Patterson,  
Mich'l Cope,  
R. E. Hobart,  
Joshua Hunt,  
Jno. Forrey, jun.  
Peter Levergood,  
Martin Hoover,  
Abm. Smith M'Kinney,  
Alexander Colley,  
James Clarke,  
Isaac Wierman,  
J. Mitchell,  
John Leech,  
John Ryan, jun.*

*Andrew Mann,  
Sam'l Lawrence,  
Thomas Stinson,  
Henry Bayer,  
Wm. Diven,  
Sam'l Jordan,  
Joseph Ranken,  
Solomon M'Nair,  
Gothiel Arth,  
Tho. Painter,  
John Taylor,  
Jabez Hyde, jun.  
Cornelius Cortright,  
William M'Bride,  
John Brown,  
J. Lawrence,  
James Todd,  
D. Cummings,  
H. B. Beeson.*

December 15, 1823.



